

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 01048 191906Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-11

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 DODE-00 H-03 NSC-10 SS-20 CU-04 OIC-04

ACDA-19 AEC-11 MC-02 DRC-01 /171 W

----- 090843

R 191700Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 489

INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS 93

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 1048

VIENNA FOR US DEL MBFR

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: CSCE: SUB-COMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY

(CBM'S); FURTHER DISCUSSION OF UK DRAFT

1. SUMMARY. DURING PAST TWO WEEKS, SUB-COMMITTEE'S DELIBERATIONS HAVE FOCUSED ON DRAFT CBM RESOLUTION THAT UK TABLED FEB 6. TWO MORE ALLIED DELS SPOKE IN FAVOR OF THE DRAFT AND SEVERAL NEUTRAL DELS ALSO COMMENTED POSITIVELY WHILE AT SAME TIME OBSERVING THAT DRAFT'S TREATMENT OF SOME OF THEIR OWN PROPOSALS WAS INADEQUATE. SERIES OF CRITICAL STATEMENTS BY WARSAW PACT DELS CULMINATED IN FEB 18 SPEECH BY SOVIET REP (AMB MENDELEVICH) WHO CONCENTRATED HIS ATTACK ON THE DRAFT'S TREATMENT OF MILITARY MOVEMENTS. MENDELEVICH ARGUED THAT MOVEMENTS ISSUE NEEDED FURTHER STUDY AND HE REITERATED THE QUESTIONS SOVIETS HAD RAISED EARLIER ON THIS ISSUE. HE DID NOT AIM ANY OF THESE

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 01048 191906Z

QUESTIONS DIRECTLY AT US DEL, HOWEVER, SO US REP REFRAINED FROM

COMMENTING. END SUMMARY

2. SINCE OUR LAST REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE'S DISCUSSION OF THE UK DRAFT CBM RESOLUTION (GENEVA 732), GREK AND ITALIAN REPS HAVE JOINED OTHER ALLIES IN PRAISING IT. ITALIAN REP, HOWEVER, WAS MILDLY CRITICAL OF DRAFT'S STIPULATION THAT PERIOD OF ADVANCE NOTIFICATION SHOULD BE "APPROXIMATELY" 60 DAYS. HE FELT THAT THIS WAS TOO IMPRECISE. AUSTRIAN AND IRISH REPS SPOKE FAVORABLY OF THE DRAFT IN GENERAL TERMS BUT BOTH THOUGHT PROVISION SHOULD BE ADDED FOR NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS/MOVEMENTS. SPANISH REPEATED THAT DRAFT'S COVERAGE OF THEIR PROPOSAL ON EXCHANGES BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL WAS TOO SCANTY. YUGOSLAVS GENERALLY PRAISED DRAFT BUT STRESSED THAT MILITARY MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE HANDELD SEPARATELY FROM MANEUVERS. MOREOVER, THEY INDICATED THEY WOULD SHORTLY BE TABLING DRAFT OF THEIR OWN WHICH WOULD TREAT SOME OF THEIR EARLIER PROPOSALS MUCH MORE SUBSTANTIALY THAN UK DRAFT HAS DONE.

3. ROMANIAN REP MADE A FEW POSITIVE REMARKS ABOUT THE UK DRAFT BUT ALSO ARGUED THAT MILITARY MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE TREATED SEPARATELY IN VIEW OF THE CONFLICTING OPINIONS THAT HAD BEEN EXPRESSED ABOUT THEIR INCLUSION AS A CBM. BULGARIAN, POLISH AND GDR REPS ALSO TOOK THIS LINE AND REITERATED FAMILIAR OBJECTIONS TO THE VARIOUS CRITERIA STIPULATED IN THE UK DRAFT. BULGARIANS AND EAST GERMANS, HOWEVER, MADE SPECIAL POINT OF APPROVING USE OF WORD "APPROXIMATELY" IN PARA I-A OF UK DRAFT CONCERNING TIMING OF NOTIFICATION AND INDICATED THAT THEY FAVORED SIMILAR FLEXIBILITY IN CONNECTION WITH MOST CRITERIA.

4. AT FEB 18 MEETING, SOVIET REP (AMB MENDELEVICH) DELIVERED HIS LONG-EXPECTED CRITICISM OF THE DRAFT. HIS TONE WAS MILD AND HE AVOIDED REITERATING SPECIFICALLY THE POSITIONS SOVIETS HAD PREVIOUSLY TAKEN AT THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE VARIOUS CRITERIA FOR NOTIFYING MANEUVERS. HE TOLD SUB-COMMITTEE SIMPLY THAT THESE POSITIONS WERE WELL KNOWN; HOWEVER, AS REPORTED IN GENEVA 952, SOVIETS HAVE PRIVATELY HINTED TO UK REP (AND LATER, IN SIMILAR TERMS, TO US REP) THAT THEY WERE PREPARED TO COMPROMISE ON SEVERAL OF THESE POINTS.

5. MENDELEVICH SAID THERE WERE SOME PARTS OF THE UK DRAFT'S CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 01048 191906Z

PREAMBLE THAT SOVIETS COULD AGREE WITH BUT THAT ITS OPERATIVE CLAUSES WERE OUT OF KEEPING WITH PREAMBLE AND WENT FAR BEYOND THE PURPOSES OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING. HE ALSO OBSERVED THAT IDEA OF HAVING SEPARATE DOCUMENT ON CBM'S WAS CONTENTIOUS BUT THAT HE WOULD DEFER UNTIL LATER REITERATING SOVIET ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF A SINGLE COMMITTEE I DOCUMENT COVERING BOTH PRINCIPLES AND CBM'S. MENDELEVICH DEVOTED MOST OF HIS SPECIFIC CRITICISMS TO THE DRAFT'S HANDLING OF MILITARY MOVEMENTS WHICH HE SAID CONTRAVENED THE

HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS. HE ARGUED THAT IT WAS IMPROPER FOR UK DRAFT TO INCORPORATE ANY CONCLUSIONS ABOUT MOVEMENTS UNTIL SUB-COMMITTEE'S STUDY OF THIS ISSUE HAD BEEN COMPLETED. HE REITERATED TH SERIES OF QUESTIONS THAT SOVIETS HAD RAISED EARLIER ABOUT THE TYPES OF MOVEMENTS THAT THE WEST WANTED TO HAVE COVERED AND SAID THESE HAD NOT BEEN FULLY ANSWERED. MENDELEVICH REFRAINED, HOWEVER, FROM SPECIFICALLY ASKING AGAIN WHETHER THERE WOULD BE NOTIFICATION OF US TROOP MOVEMENTS ACROSS THE ATLANTIC TO EUROPE AND US REP, THEREFORE, DID NOT COMMENT. SOVIET REP, MOREOVER, STATED IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO SETTLE ALL SUCH QUESTIONS RIGHT NOW AND THAT ONE COULD INSTEAD RETURN TO THIS PROBLEM LATER.

6. UK REP DID NOT IMMEDIATELY REPLY TO MENDELEVICH'S STATEMENT BUT HAD EARLIER ADDRESSED SOME OF THE COMMENTS OTHER DELS HAD MADE ON THE BRITISH DRAFT. IN THESE REJOINDERS, THE UK REP DEFENDED THE DRAFT'S COMBINED TREATMENT OF MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS AND EXPRESSED INTEREST IN ADDING SOME FORMULATION ON "SELF RESTRAINT" TO HELP SATISFY THE CONCERNS OF THOSE WHO WERE ARGUING FOR MEASURES AIMED AT ACTUALLY LIMITING MILITARY MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS
E E E E E E E

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, SECURITY, MEETING DELEGATIONS, MILITARY EXERCISES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 19 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA01048
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740225/aaaaaxeit
Line Count: 130
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 21 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <21 MAR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SUB-COMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBM'S); FURTHER DISCUSSION OF UK DRAFT
TAGS: PFOR, UK, US
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005